AO 472 (Rev. 09/08) Detention Order Pending Trial - MIWD (Rev. 10/09) Case~1.12-Cr-00158-PLM ECF No. 11 filed 06/26/12 PageID.16 Page 1 of 1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

	United States of America	ORDER OF DETENTION PENDING TRIAL
	V. Oscar Omar Silva-Najera	Case No. 1:12-cr-00158-PLM
		form Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f), I conclude that these facts require
	·	indings of Fact
(1)		in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1) and has previously been convicted of that would have been a federal offense if federal jurisdiction had
	a crime of violence as defined in 18 U.S.C. § 3 which the prison term is 10 years or more.	8156(a)(4), or an offense listed in 18 U.S.C. § 2332b(g)(5)(B) for
	an offense for which the maximum sentence is	s death or life imprisonment.
	an offense for which a maximum prison term of	of ten years or more is prescribed in:
	a felony committed after the defendant had be U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1)(A)-(C), or comparable state	en convicted of two or more prior federal offenses described in 18 e or local offenses.
	any felony that is not a crime of violence but in a minor victim	volves:
		or destructive device or any other dangerous weapon C. § 2250
(2)	The offense described in finding (1) was committed or local offense.	while the defendant was on release pending trial for a federal, state
(3)	A period of less than 5 years has elapsed since the offense described in finding (1).	date of conviction defendant's release from prison for the
(4)	Findings (1), (2) and (3) establish a rebuttable presu person or the community. I further find that defenda	mption that no condition will reasonably assure the safety of another nt has not rebutted that presumption.
	Alternativ	ve Findings (A)
(1)	There is probable cause to believe that the defendar	nt has committed an offense
	for which a maximum prison term of ten years Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et	
	under 18 U.S.C. § 924(c).	
(2)	The defendant has not rebutted the presumption est will reasonably assure the defendant's appearance a	ablished by finding (1) that no condition or combination of conditions and the safety of the community.
1 (1)		ve Findings (B)
	There is a serious risk that the defendant will not app	
(2)	There is a serious risk that the defendant will endang	
		the Reasons for Detention
	a preponderance of the evidence that:	ne detention hearing establishes by clear and convincing
2. Defer	ndant waived his detention hearing, electing not to condant is subject to an immigration detainer and would ndant may bring the issue of his continuing detention	
	Part III – Direction	ns Regarding Detention

Part III – Directions Regarding Detention

The defendant is committed to the custody of the Attorney General or a designated representative for confinement in a corrections facility separate, to the extent practicable, from persons awaiting or serving sentences or held in custody pending appeal. The defendant must be afforded a reasonable opportunity to consult privately with defense counsel. On order of United States Court or on request of an attorney for the Government, the person in charge of the corrections facility must deliver the defendant to the United States marshal for a court appearance.

Date: _	June 26, 2012	Judge's Signature: /s/ Ellen S. Carmody	
		Name and Title: Ellen S. Carmody, U.S. Magistrate Judge	